arXiv:1607.04039v1 [stat.ME] 14 Jul 2016

Comparing cluster-level dynamic treatment regimens using sequential, multiple assignment, randomized trials: Regression estimation and sample size considerations

Tim NeCamp *
Department of Statistics, University of Michigan
Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research

Amy Kilbourne
Department of Psychiatry, University of Michigan Medical School
Quality Enhancement Research Initiative, HSR&D, US Department of Veterans Affairs

Daniel Almirall
Department of Statistics, University of Michigan
Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research

July 14th, 2016

Abstract

Cluster-level dynamic treatment regimens can be used to guide sequential, intervention or treatment decision-making at the cluster level in order to improve outcomes at the individual or patient-level. In a cluster-level DTR, the intervention or treatment is potentially adapted and re-adapted over time based on changes in the cluster that could be impacted by prior intervention, including based on aggregate measures of the individuals or patients that comprise it. Cluster-randomized sequential multiple assignment randomized trials (SMARTs) can be used to answer multiple open questions preventing scientists from developing high-quality cluster-level DTRs. In a cluster-randomized SMART, sequential randomizations occur at the cluster level and outcomes are at the individual level. This manuscript makes two contributions to the design and analysis of cluster-randomized SMARTs: First, a weighted least squares regression approach is proposed for comparing the mean of a patient-level outcome between the cluster-level DTRs embedded in a SMART. The regression approach facilitates the use of baseline covariates which is often critical in the analysis of cluster-level trials. Second, sample size calculators are derived for two common cluster-randomized SMART designs for use when the primary aim is a between-DTR comparison of the mean of a continuous patient-level outcome. The methods are motivated by the Adaptive Implementation of Effective Programs Trial, which is, to our knowledge, the first-ever cluster-randomized SMART in psychiatry.

Keywords: adaptive interventions, adaptive treatment strategies, dynamic treatment regimens, group-randomized, cluster-randomized, ADEPT

*tnecamp@umich.edu

Introduction

Interventions aimed at improving individual-level outcomes often occur at a cluster-level (Raudenbush and Bryk 2002; Donner and Klar 2010; Murray 1998). Often, it may be necessary to use a tailored, dynamic approach to intervention in order to address cluster-level heterogeneity in the kind of intervention necessary to improve individual-level outcomes (Kilbourne et al. 2013).

Cluster-level dynamic treatment regimens (DTRs), also known as adaptive interventions, can be used to guide such sequential intervention decision-making at the cluster level. In a cluster-level DTR, the cluster-level intervention is potentially adapted (or re-adapted) over time based on changes in the cluster that could be impacted by prior intervention (e.g. adapting based on aggregate measures of the individuals that comprise it). A cluster-level DTR may also include intervention components dynamically tailored to the individuals within clusters.

Sequential multiple assignment randomized trials (SMART) represent an important data collection tool for informing how best to construct DTRs (Kosorok and Moodie 2015; Lavori and Dawson 2014; Chakraborty and Moodie 2013; Lei et al. 2012; Murphy 2005). The focus of most SMARTs to date has been the development of individual-level DTRs to improve individual-level outcomes (e.g., see Methodology Center (2016)).

There has been much less focus on analytic or design issues related to cluster-randomized SMARTs for developing cluster-level DTRs. In a cluster-randomized SMART, randomizations occur at the cluster level, yet outcomes are at the level of individuals within the cluster. Using the Adaptive Implementation of Effective Programs Trial (ADEPT; Kilbourne et al. (2014)) as a motivating example, the focus of this paper is on primary aim analysis and sample size considerations in cluster-randomized SMARTs. ADEPT, which is currently in the field, is to our knowledge the first-ever cluster-randomized SMART. The overarching goal of ADEPT is to develop a cluster-level DTR to improve the adoption of an evidence-based practice (EBP) for mood disorders in community-based mental health clinics and thereby improve patient-level mental health outcomes.

This manuscript makes two contributions to the design and analysis of cluster-randomized SMARTs. First, we develop a regression approach for comparing the mean of a continuous patient-level outcome between the cluster-level DTRs embedded in a SMART. The regression approach is an extension of the estimator in Nahum-Shani et al. (2012) first introduced by Orellana et al. (2010). The regression approach facilitates the use of individual- and cluster-level baseline (pre-randomization) covariates in the analysis of data from a cluster-randomized SMART.

Second, we develop sample size formulae (for the total number of clusters) to be used when the primary aim of the cluster-randomized SMART is a comparison of the mean of a continuous patient-level outcome between two DTRs beginning with different treatments. This is a common primary aim in SMARTs; see Oetting et al. (2011, continuous end of study outcome) and Li and Murphy (2011, survival outcome).

The regression approach can be used with any cluster-randomized SMART with repeated cluster-level randomizations. Sample size formulae are developed for two

common types of two-stage SMART designs: the one used in ADEPT, and for a more common type of SMART.

Consistent with the proposed regression approach, which facilitates the use of baseline covariates, the sample size formulae allow scientists to incorporate the correlation between a pre-specified baseline cluster-level covariate and patient-level outcomes, which leads to a reduction in the minimum number of clusters necessary (Spybrook et al. 2011). This manuscript extends the work of Ghosh et al. (2015), which develops sample size calculators for a single type of cluster-randomized SMART in a non-regression context, i.e., without covariates.

Sequential, Multiple Assignment Randomized Trials with Cluster-level Randomization

Sequential multiple assignment randomized trials (SMARTs) are multi-stage randomized trial designs used explicitly for the purpose of building high-quality dynamic treatment regimens (Lavori and Dawson 2000; Murphy 2005). The multiple stages at which randomizations occur correspond to critical intervention decision points. At each decision point, randomization is used to address a question concerning the dosage (duration, frequency or amount), intensity, type, or delivery of treatment.

Here we consider SMARTs for developing cluster-level DTRs where the unit of randomization (and re-randomization) is a cluster and the outcomes are measured at the level of the individual.

Motivating Example: The ADEPT SMART Study

These methods are motivated by the Adaptive Implementation of Effective Programs Trial (ADEPT; Kilbourne et al. (2014) and see Figure 1), a cluster-randomized SMART in psychiatry. The overall aim of ADEPT is to develop a cluster-level DTR to improve the adoption of an EBP for mood disorders in community-based mental health clinics across the US states of Colorado and Michigan. The patient-level EBP is known as Life Goals (Kilbourne et al. 2012), a collaborative care, psychosocial intervention for mood disorders delivered to patients in six individual or group sessions. The primary outcome in ADEPT is a continuous, patient-level measure of mental health quality of life (MH-QOL).

ADEPT includes several interventions: the replicating effectiveness program (REP), REP plus External Facilitation (REP+EF), and REP plus External and Internal Facilitation (REP+EF+IF). REP is a cluster-level intervention focused on standardizing the implementation of the EBP into routine care through toolkit development, provider training, and program assistance. Facilitation is a cluster-level coaching intervention to help support the use of EBPs. External Facilitation is by phone and focuses on technical aspects of how to adopt the EBP; Internal Facilitation is in-person and involves working with a clinic manager to further embed the EBP.

ADEPT, which is currently in the field, involves community-based mental health clinics (approximately $N = 60$) that have failed to respond to an initial 6 months of REP (pre-randomization). During these 6 months, each clinic $i = 1, \ldots, N$ is expected to identify approximately $m_i = 10$ to 25 patients with mood disorders, all of which are



Figure 1. Schematic of ADEPT. The encircled R signifies randomization; cluster-level randomizations occurred at baseline and after 6 months of REP+EF or REP+EF+IF following identification of clinic responder status.

followed for patient-level outcomes throughout the study. Clinics that enter the study (i.e. did not respond to REP at month 6) are randomized with equal probability to receive additional REP+EF or REP+EF+IF. After another 6 months, (i) REP + EF sites that are still non-responsive are randomized with equal probability to either continue REP + EF or augment with IF (REP + EF + IF) for an additional 12 months, and (ii) facilitation interventions are discontinued for sites that are responsive. A clinic is identified as "not responding" at months 6 and 12 if $< 50\%$ of the patients identified to be part of Life Goals during months 0-6 have received $\geq$3 Life Goals sessions.

Table 1. The three DTRs embedded in ADEPT (Figure 1)

DTR Label (a_1, a_2)	Second-stage Treatment	Status at end of second-stage	Third-stage Treatment	A_1	R	A_2	Cell in Figure	Known IPW
$(1, 1)$	REP+EF	Resp	REP	1	1		A	2
		Non Resp	REP+EF	1	0	1	B	4
$(1, -1)$	REP+EF	Resp	REP	1	1		A	2
		Non Resp	REP+EF+IF	1	0	-1	C	4
$(-1, .)$	REP+EF+IF	Resp	REP	-1	1		D	2
		Non Resp	REP+EF+IF	-1	0		E	2

By design, ADEPT has three DTRs embedded within it (see Table 1); each DTR is labeled (a_1, a_2). DTR $(1, -1)$, for example, offers REP+EF at month 6; then,

for clinics that remain non-responsive at month 12, REP+EF is augmented with IF; whereas, EF is discontinued for clinics who are responsive at month 12.

The Prototypical SMART Design

In ADEPT, only clinics not responding to REP+EF were re-randomized at the next stage. This type of SMART (but with individual-level randomizations) has been previously employed in autism research, see Kasari et al. (2014) and Almirall et al. (2016).

Many other types of SMART designs are possible (see Methodology Center (2016) for a comprehensive list with individual-level randomizations), including SMARTs where all units are subsequently re-randomized to the same set of next-stage intervention options (e.g., Chronis-Tuscano et al. (2016)) and others where all units are re-randomized, but to different next-stage interventions options depending on response/non-response to first-stage intervention (e.g., Lu et al. (2015)). Ultimately, the decision to choose a particular type of SMART is driven by scientific considerations.

By far the most common type of SMART is a two-stage design where (i) all units are randomized to two first-stage treatment options, (ii) a subset of units at the end of stage 1 (e.g., non-responders) are re-randomized to second-stage intervention options (regardless of choice of first-stage intervention), and (iii) the remaining subset of units (e.g., responders) are not re-randomized. See Figure 2 for a generic example. We call this a "prototypical SMART design" given its popularity. Note that in the case of the prototypical SMART, there are four embedded DTRs; see Table 2.



Figure 2. Schematic of a prototypical SMART design

Published examples of the prototypical SMART (with individual-level randomizations) include Pelham et al. (2016) in attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder, Gunlicks-Stoessel et al. (2015) in adolescent depression, August et al. (2014) in conduct disorder

Table 2. The four DTRs embedded in a prototypical SMART (Figure 2)

DTR Label (a_1, a_2)	First-stage Treatment	Status at end of first-stage	Second-stage Treatment	A_1	R	A_2	Cell in Figure	Known IPW
$(1,1)$	$T1_1$	Resp	$T2_1$	1	1		A	2
		Non Resp	$T2_2$	1	0	1	B	4
$(1,-1)$	$T1_1$	Resp	$T2_1$	1	1		A	2
		Non Resp	$T2_3$	1	0	-1	C	4
$(-1,1)$	$T1_2$	Resp	$T2_4$	-1	1		D	2
		Non Resp	$T2_5$	-1	0	1	E	4
$(-1,-1)$	$T1_2$	Resp	$T2_4$	-1	1		D	2
		Non Resp	$T2_6$	-1	0	-1	F	4

prevention, Sherwood et al. (2016) and Naar-King et al. (2015) in weight loss, and McKay et al. (2015) in cocaine/alcohol use.

Common Primary Aims in a SMART

This manuscript develops methods for comparing the mean of a continuous individual-level outcome between the DTRs embedded in a cluster-randomized SMART. This comparison can be conceptualized in various ways as a primary aim (Oetting et al. 2011; Almirall et al. 2014): (i) To compare first stage intervention options (averaging over the second stage intervention). In ADEPT, this is a comparison of DTR (-1,.) vs the DTRs {(1,1), (1,-1)} (this was the primary aim in ADEPT; see Kilbourne et al. (2014)). (ii) To compare second stage intervention options (averaging over the first stage intervention). In the prototypical design, if the second stage treatments are the same for both first stage treatments, this would be a comparison of DTRs {(1,1), (-1,1)} vs DTRs {(1,-1), (-1,-1)} (e.g. see aim 3 in Pelham et al. (2016)). (iii) To compare the mean outcome between two DTRs beginning with the same first-stage treatment. In ADEPT, this is a comparison of DTR (1,1) vs (1, -1). (iv) To compare the mean outcome between two DTRs that begin with different first stage treatments. In ADEPT, this is a comparison of (1,1) vs (-1,.) or of (1,-1) vs (-1,.).

The next section develops a regression estimator that can be used to address all of these primary aims using data from a cluster-randomized SMART. Following that, we derive sample size formulae for aim (iv). Simple extensions of standard sample size formulae may be used for primary aims (i), (ii), and (iii).

Methodology

Marginal Mean Model

For each SMART participant $j = 1, \ldots, m_i$ within each site $i = 1, \ldots, N$ we envision a primary end-of-study individual-level outcome Y_{ij}. Let the $p \times 1$ vector X_{ij} denote a pre-specified set of baseline covariates measured prior to the initial randomization.

X_{ij} may include both patient-level covariates (e.g. age) or cluster-level covariates (e.g. clinic location).

Denote $E_{a_1,a_2}(Y_{ij}|X_{ij})$ as the marginal mean of Y_{ij} had the entire population been assigned to the DTR (a_1, a_2), conditional on baseline covariates, X_{ij} (Rubin 1978; Neyman et al. 1935). $E_{a_1,a_2}(Y_{ij}|X_{ij})$ is *marginal* in that it averages over the response/non-response measure used in the DTR (a_1, a_2).

Let $\mu(X_{ij}, a_1, a_2; \beta, \eta)$ denote a marginal structural model (Orellana et al. 2010; Murphy et al. 2001; Robins et al. 2000; Hernán et al. 2000; Robins 1999) for the mean $E_{a_1,a_2}(Y_{ij}|X_{ij})$ which is linear in the unknown parameters (β, η). We provide examples below. β is a $q \times 1$ vector used to denote the causal effects between the DTRs, and η is the $p \times 1$ vector used to denote the associational effects between X_{ij} and Y_{ij}.

Example 1: ADEPT. An example marginal mean model for the ADEPT study is

$$\mu(X_{ij}, a_1, a_2; \beta, \eta) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 a_1 + \beta_2 a_2 I_{a_1=1} + \eta^T X_{ij} \tag{1}$$

Here we use a β with $q = 3$ to capture the causal effects for the 3 embedded DTRs. X_{ij} could include, for example, the three baseline site-level variables used to stratify the initial randomization: US state (Colorado vs Michigan), whether the site was a primary care or mental health site, and a site-average of individual MH-QOL scores. Using this model to address a primary aim of type (iv) above, the difference in the mean outcome had all clusters received DTR (1,1) vs had all clusters received DTR (-1,.)—i.e., $E_{1,1}(Y_{ij}) - E_{\text{-}1,.}(Y_{ij})$—is given by $2\beta_1 + \beta_2$.

Example 2: Prototypical SMART. In the prototypical SMART, we use a β with $q = 4$ to capture the causal effects for the 4 embedded DTRs.

$$\mu(X_{ij}, a_1, a_2; \beta, \eta) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 a_1 + \beta_2 a_2 + \beta_3 a_1 a_2 + \eta^T X_{ij} \tag{2}$$

Here, the comparison of mean outcomes had all clusters received DTR (1,1) vs had all clusters received DTR (-1,-1)—i.e. $E_{1,1}(Y_{ij}) - E_{\text{-}1,\text{-}1}(Y_{ij})$—is given by $2(\beta_1 + \beta_2)$.

Estimation

We now present an estimator for the unknown (β, η).

Notation. Let $\mathbf{X}_i$ denote the $m_i \times p$ matrix $(X_{i1}, X_{i2}, \ldots, X_{im_i})^T$ of covariates and let $\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{X}_i, a_1, a_2; \beta, \eta)$ be the $m_i \times 1$ vector of means $(\mu(X_{i1}, a_1, a_2; \beta, \eta), \ldots, \mu(X_{im_i}, a_1, a_2; \beta, \eta))^T$. Let $\mathbf{Y}_i$ be the $m_i \times 1$ vector of responses $(Y_{i1}, Y_{i2}, \ldots, Y_{im_i})^T$. Let A_{1i} denote the observed (i.e., randomly assigned) stage 1 treatment. In ADEPT, $A_{1i} = 1$ implies that cluster i received REP+EF as an initial treatment while $A_{1i} = -1$ implies cluster i received REP+EF+IF. Let R_i, a binary variable, denote responder/non-responder status at the end of stage 1. In ADEPT, $R_i = 1$ if cluster i is a responder at the end of the first stage and $R_i = 0$ if cluster i is a non-responder. Let A_{2i} denote the observed (i.e., randomly assigned) stage 2 treatment. Note that, depending on the SMART design, A_{2i} may not be defined for some clusters i depending on the value of (A_{1i}, R_i). In ADEPT, A_{2i} is defined only for clusters with $A_{1i} = 1$ and $R_i = 0$. In the prototypical SMART, A_{2i} is not defined for clusters with $R_i = 1$. See Tables 1 and 2.

Estimator. Building on Orellana et al. (2010), Nahum-Shani et al. (2012) and Lu et al. (2015), we obtain $\hat{\beta}, \hat{\eta}$ by solving for β, η in the following estimating equations:

$$0 = \sum_{i=1}^{N} U_i(A_{1i}, R_i, A_{2i}, \mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{Y}_i; \beta, \eta) \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{(a_1,a_2)} I(A_{1i}, R_i, A_{2i}, a_1, a_2) \cdot W_i D(\mathbf{X}_i, a_1, a_2)^T V(a_1, a_2, m_i)^{-1}(\mathbf{Y}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{X}_i, a_1, a_2; \beta, \eta)). \quad (3)$$

$D(\mathbf{X}_i, a_1, a_2)$ is the $m_i \times (q + p)$ derivative of $\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{X}_i, a_1, a_2; \beta, \eta)$ with respect to (β, η); it can be thought of as the "design matrix" for DTR (a_1, a_2). For example, using the model in Equation 1 for ADEPT, the jth row of $D(\mathbf{X}_i, a_1, a_2)$ is $(1, a_1, a_2 I_{a_1=1}, X_{ij})$.

$V(a_1, a_2, m_i)$ is a working model for $\text{Cov}_{a_1,a_2}(\mathbf{Y}_i|\mathbf{X}_i)$, the $m_i \times m_i$ covariance matrix for $\mathbf{Y}_i$ conditional on $\mathbf{X}_i$ for DTR (a_1, a_2). In practice, $V(a_1, a_2, m_i)$ is unknown and must be estimated prior to solving Equation 3; see Implementation section. Note that $V(a_1, a_2, m_i)$ depends on m_i through its size, not its structure.

$I(A_{1i}, R_i, A_{2i}, a_1, a_2)$ (abbreviated $I_{i(a_1,a_2)}$) is a cluster-level indicator function which identifies whether (equals 1) or not (equals 0) cluster i was assigned to a sequence of treatments that is consistent with DTR (a_1, a_2). For example, in ADEPT, if $A_{1i} = 1, R_i = 0$, and A_{2i} = -1, then cluster i is consistent only with DTR (1,-1); whereas if $A_{1i} = 1, R_i = 1$, then cluster i is consistent with both DTR (1,1) and (1,-1).

W_i are the known cluster-level inverse probability weights (IPW, Orellana et al. (2010)), $W_i = 1/[Pr(A_{1i})Pr(A_{2i}|A_{1i}, R_i)]$. See Tables 1 and 2 for the known values of W_i in ADEPT and the prototypical SMART.

Following Orellana et al. (2010), the estimators $(\hat{\beta}, \hat{\eta})$, derived from solving Equation 3 are consistent and asymptotically normally distributed if the mean model (e.g., Equation 1 for ADEPT) is correctly specified. As in the generalized estimating equations literature (Liang and Zeger 1993, 1986), there is no requirement that $V(a_1, a_2, m_i)$ be a correct model for $\text{Cov}_{a_1,a_2}(\mathbf{Y}_i|\mathbf{X}_i)$. See supplementary material for a sketch of the derivations.

Intuition for the Weights. By design, in the observed data in a SMART, different clusters have different probabilities of being consistent with a specific DTR. For example, clusters assigned to cells A and B are consistent with DTR (1,1) (see Figure 1 and Table 1). However, clusters assigned to cell A had a 50% chance of being consistent with DTR (1,1), whereas clusters assigned to cell B had 25% chance of being consistent with DTR (1,1). Ignoring this known imbalance—i.e., using an unweighted average of observations in cells A and B to estimate the mean outcome had the entire population of clusters been assigned to DTR (1,1)—would cause the Cell A observations to have an unfairly larger influence on your estimate, leading to bias. The weights are designed to counteract this known imbalance and ensure all clusters consistent with DTR (a_1, a_2) are represented equally. For example, in ADEPT, clusters in cell A are weighted by 2, whereas clusters in cell B are weighted by 4.

Implementation

Typically, in clustered settings, our working model for $\text{Cov}_{a_1,a_2}(\mathbf{Y}_i|\mathbf{X}_i)$, $V(a_1, a_2, m_i)$, is taken to be "exchangeable" and independent of $\mathbf{X}_i$, i.e., $V(a_1, a_2, m_i) = \sigma^{2*}_{a_1,a_2} \cdot Exch_{m_i}(\rho^*_{a_1,a_2})$. Here $\sigma^{2*}_{a_1,a_2}$ and $\rho^*_{a_1,a_2}$ are scalars representing the conditional (on $\mathbf{X}_i$) variance and intra-cluster correlation (ICC) of the outcome under DTR (a_1, a_2), and $Exch_{m_i}(\rho^*_{a_1,a_2})$ is an m_ixm_i exchangeable matrix (i.e. $[Exch(\rho)]_{ii} = 1$ and $[Exch(\rho)]_{ij} = \rho$ for $i \neq j$). The estimators $(\hat{\beta}, \hat{\eta})$ are obtained using the following steps:

Step 1: Solve Equation 3 with $V(a_1, a_2, m_i)$ set to the identity matrix to obtain $(\hat{\beta}_0, \hat{\eta}_0)$. For each embedded DTR (a_1, a_2) obtain the residuals $\hat{\epsilon}_{ij,(a_1,a_2)}(\hat{\beta}_0, \hat{\eta}_0) = Y_{ij} - \hat{\mu}(X_{ij}, a_1, a_2; \hat{\beta}_0, \hat{\eta}_0)$.

Step 2: Estimate $\sigma^{2*}_{a_1,a_2}$ and $\rho^*_{a_1,a_2}$ using:

$$\hat{\sigma}^{2*}_{a_1,a_2} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N}[W_i I_{i(a_1,a_2)} \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} \hat{\epsilon}^2_{ij,(a_1,a_2)}]}{\sum_{i=1}^{N} W_i I_{i(a_1,a_2)} m_i} \text{ and } \hat{\rho}^*_{a_1,a_2} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N}[W_i I_{i(a_1,a_2)} \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} \sum_{k\neq j}^{m_i} \hat{\epsilon}_{ij,(a_1,a_2)} \hat{\epsilon}_{ik,(a_1,a_2)}]}{\hat{\sigma}^{2*}_{a_1,a_2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} W_i I_{i(a_1,a_2)} m_i (m_i - 1)}. \tag{4}$$

Step 3: Solve Equation 3 with $V(a_1, a_2, m_i)$ set to $\hat{V}(a_1, a_2, m_i) = \hat{\sigma}^{2*}_{a_1,a_2} \cdot Exch_{m_i}(\hat{\rho}^*_{a_1,a_2})$ to obtain $(\hat{\beta}_1, \hat{\eta}_1)$.

Step 4: Repeat Steps 2 and 3 with $\hat{\epsilon}_{ij,(a_1,a_2)}(\hat{\beta}_1, \hat{\eta}_1)$ to obtain final estimates $(\hat{\beta}, \hat{\eta})$.

In simulations we do not find appreciable performance gains by iterating Steps 2 and 3 more than twice. Equations 4 can be seen as extensions of standard working correlation estimators used in GEE literature (Liang and Zeger 1993, 1986).

Some analysts may choose to specify a working correlation structure which is equal for all DTR's. In this case, one could take a simple average of the estimates in Equation 4 across all regimens (a_1, a_2).

Lastly, it is well known that by replacing the known W_i in each step above with estimated weights, statistical efficiency of the estimators may be improved (Robins et al. 1995; Hernan et al. 2002; Hirano et al. 2003; Brumback 2009; Williamson et al. 2014; Bembom and van der Laan 2007)

Standard Error Estimation

To estimate the variance of $(\hat{\beta}, \hat{\eta})$ we use the plug-in estimator, given by the $(q + p) \times (q + p)$ matrix $1/N \cdot \hat{\Sigma}_{\hat{\beta},\hat{\eta}} = 1/N \cdot \hat{J}^{-1}\hat{A}\hat{J}^{-1}$ where

$$\hat{J} = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{(a_1,a_2)} I(A_{1i}, R_i, A_{2i}, a_1, a_2) W_i D(\mathbf{X}_i, a_1, a_2)^T \hat{V}(a_1, a_2, m_i)^{-1} D(\mathbf{X}_i, a_1, a_2)$$

$$\hat{A} = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} U_i(A_{1i}, R_i, A_{2i}, \mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{Y}_i; \hat{\beta}, \hat{\eta}) U_i^T(A_{1i}, R_i, A_{2i}, \mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{Y}_i; \hat{\beta}, \hat{\eta}).$$

See supplementary materials for an adjustment to the standard errors for the case when weights are estimated.

Hypothesis Testing

For any linear combination of (β, η), say $c^T(\beta, \eta)$ where c is a $(q+p)$-dimensional column vector, we use the univariate Wald statistic $Z = \sqrt{N}c^T(\hat{\beta}, \hat{\eta})/\sqrt{c^T \hat{\Sigma}_{\hat{\beta},\hat{\eta}} c}$ to test the null hypothesis $H_0 : c^T(\beta, \eta) = 0$. For example, in ADEPT, to test the difference in means had the entire population of clusters followed DTR (1,1) versus DTR (-1,.) (i.e. primary aim (iv) above) using the model in Equation 1, we set $c = (0, 2, 1, 0_p)^T$. In large samples Z has a standard normal distribution under the null hypothesis. Hence, an α level test is "reject H_0 when $|Z| > z_{\alpha/2}$," where $z_{\alpha/2}$ is the upper $\alpha/2$ quantile of a standard normal distribution.

Sample Size Formulae

For both ADEPT and the prototypical SMART, we develop sample size formulae for the total number of clusters N for comparing the mean patient-level outcome between two embedded DTRs beginning with different stage 1 treatments. Specifically, for ADEPT, formulae are developed for testing null hypotheses of the form $H_0 : E_{1,b_2}(Y_{ij}) - E_{\text{-}1,.}(Y_{ij}) = 0$ for a fixed $b_2 \in (-1, 1)$ against alternate hypotheses of the form $H_1 : E_{1,b_2}(Y_{ij}) - E_{\text{-}1,.}(Y_{ij}) = \delta\sqrt{(\sigma^2_{1,b_2} + \sigma^2_{\text{-}1,.})/2}$. Here, δ is a standardized effect size (Cohen 1988) and $\sigma^2_{b_1,b_2}$ is the outcome's unconditional variance under DTR (b_1, b_2). For the prototypical SMART, formulae are developed for testing null hypotheses of the form $H_0 : E_{1,b_2}(Y_{ij}) - E_{\text{-}1,c_2}(Y_{ij}) = 0$ for a fixed $(b_2, c_2) \in (-1, 1)^2$ against alternate hypotheses of the form $H_1 : E_{1,b_2}(Y_{ij}) - E_{\text{-}1,c_2}(Y_{ij}) = \delta\sqrt{(\sigma^2_{1,b_2} + \sigma^2_{\text{-}1,c_2})/2}$. The formulae are based on using (3) to estimate β in marginal models of the form (1) or (2) as follows: (i) with or without a pre-specified cluster-level covariate X_i, (ii) known weights W, and (iii) an exchangeable working covariance structure for V. In addition, formulae are based on a constant cluster size $m_i = m$ for all i (extensions to the unequal cluster size case can be done as in Kerry and Bland (2001) or by conservatively setting m equal to the minimum cluster size), large sample approximations, and rely on the following *working population assumptions*:

1. **Equal exchangeable covariance matrices across regimens:** We assume the true unconditional covariance matrices are equal for the two DTRs we are testing (e.g. $\text{Cov}_{1,b_2}(\mathbf{Y}_i) = \text{Cov}_{-1,c_2}(\mathbf{Y}_i) = \sigma^2 * Exch(\rho)$ in the prototypical SMART)
2. **Conditional covariance inequality:** For a specific DTR, we assume non-responders do not vary from the marginal mean significantly more than responders. This assumption applies to different DTRs based on design, see below. A concern about this assumption should be raised only if the scientist, apriori, believed that, for a specific DTR, non-responders had significantly larger variances than responders or if the response rate was expected to be much larger than .5 (which is atypical for SMART designs). See Appendix A for details.
3. **Correct marginal mean model:** We assume that $E_{a_1,a_2}(Y_{ij} \mid X_i) = \mu(X_i, a_1, a_2; \beta, \eta)$ for the pre-specified cluster-level X_i, where

$\mu(X_i, a_1, a_2; \beta, \eta)$ is of the form (1) or (2). When X_i is not included in (1) or (2), this assumption is met trivially.

Each formula is a function of the cluster size m, the effect size δ, the outcome's ICC, ρ, the probability of a cluster responding after receiving initial treatment 1, p_1 (i.e. $p_1 = \mathbb{P}(R = 1|A_1 = 1)$), the probability of a cluster responding after receiving initial treatment -1, $p_{\text{-}1}$, and the standard normal quantiles $z_{\alpha/2}$ and z_β, where α is the size of our test and $1 - \beta$ is the power. We first provide formulae for estimation without covariates followed by the case when a cluster-level covariate X_i is used.

ADEPT Sample Size Formula

For ADEPT, working assumption 2 is: $E_{1,b_2}[(\mathbf{Y}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}(1, b_2))(\mathbf{Y}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}(1, b_2))^T | R = 0] \preceq E_{1,b_2}[(\mathbf{Y}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}(1, b_2))(\mathbf{Y}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}(1, b_2))^T] = \text{Cov}_{1,b_2}(\mathbf{Y}_i)$. Also, for ADEPT, working assumption 1 can be relaxed to $\sigma^2_{1,b_2} \leq \sigma^2_{-1,.}$. Under these assumptions we obtain the sample size formula:

$$N = \frac{4(z_\beta + z_{\alpha/2})^2}{m\delta^2} \cdot (1 + (m-1)\rho) \cdot (1 + \frac{1 - p_1}{2}) \tag{5}$$

Prototypical Sample Size Formula

For Prototypical SMART designs, working assumption 2 is: for both DTRs in our test, i.e. $(a_1, a_2) = (1, b_2)$ and $(-1, c_2)$, $E_{a_1,a_2}[(\mathbf{Y}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}(a_1, a_2))(\mathbf{Y}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}(a_1, a_2))^T | R = 0] \preceq E_{a_1,a_2}[(\mathbf{Y}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}(a_1, a_2))(\mathbf{Y}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}(a_1, a_2))^T] = \text{Cov}_{a_1,a_2}(\mathbf{Y}_i)$. Under these assumptions we obtain the sample size formula:

$$N = \frac{4(z_\beta + z_{\alpha/2})^2}{m\delta^2} \cdot (1 + (m-1)\rho) \cdot (1 + \frac{(1 - p_1) + (1 - p_{\text{-}1})}{2}) \tag{6}$$

Note this formula is identical to the formula in Ghosh et al. (2015).

The sample size formulae in Equations 5 and 6 are intuitive. The first two terms in both formulae are identical; these terms comprise the formulae for the sample size for the difference in means in a 2-arm randomized control trial (RCT) with cluster-level randomization (Donner and Klar 2010). The second term, in particular, is the expression for the variance inflation factor (VIF) arising from cluster-randomized trials. If $\rho = 0$ (i.e. VIF = 1), there is no inflation due to cluster randomization because we have no correlation within clusters. As ρ increases, each new observation within a cluster provides less unique information causing the VIF to increase. This, in turn, leads to an increase in sample size, N.

The third term, which is unique to SMARTs, is used to account for the fact that some clusters are re-randomized depending on response at the end of stage 1; hence, this last term is a function of the rate of response to first stage intervention. To understand this third term, it is useful to consider two extremes in the context of the prototypical SMART: If both response rates $(p_1, p_{\text{-}1})$ are 1, then there is no re-randomization and the design is analogous to a 2-arm cluster-randomized RCT (here, the third term is equal to 1). If, on the other hand, both response rates are 0, then all clusters are randomized twice; here, the third term is equal to 2. Note how the the third term is different for

ADEPT and the prototypical SMART due to the difference in randomization schemes. Also, in the special case where response rates to initial treatments are equal (i.e. $p_1 = p_{\text{-1}}$), we would end up with the clustered version of the sample size formula in Oetting et al. (2011).

Sample Size Formula with a Cluster-level Covariate

When including a cluster-level covariate in (1) or (2), working assumption 2 is similar for each corresponding design, except it involves the conditional (on $\mathbf{X}_i$) marginal mean, i.e. $E_{a_1,a_2}[(\mathbf{Y}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{X}_i, a_1, a_2))(\mathbf{Y}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{X}_i, a_1, a_2))^T | R = 0] \preceq E_{a_1,a_2}[(\mathbf{Y}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{X}_i, a_1, a_2))(\mathbf{Y}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{X}_i, a_1, a_2))^T]$. Also, our formula depends on $\text{Cor}(Y, X)$, which is the is the scalar correlation between the outcome Y_{ij} and the cluster-level covariate X_i under the DTRs in our test. Note that under assumptions 1 and 3, this correlation is constant across these DTRs. We obtain the following sample size formula for ADEPT:

$$N = \frac{4(z_\beta + z_{\alpha/2})^2}{m\delta^2} \cdot (1 + (m-1)\rho^*) \cdot (1 + \frac{1 - p_1}{2}) \cdot [1 - \text{Cor}^2(Y, X)] \quad (7)$$

For the prototypical SMART, the sample size formula is:

$$N = \frac{4(z_\beta + z_{\alpha/2})^2}{m\delta^2} \cdot (1 + (m-1)\rho^*) \cdot (1 + \frac{(1 - p_1) + (1 - p_{\text{-1}})}{2}) \cdot [1 - \text{Cor}^2(Y, X)] \quad (8)$$

where $\rho^* = \frac{\rho - \text{Cor}^2(Y,X)}{1 - \text{Cor}^2(Y,X)}$

The use a covariate leads to two changes in the sample size formulae. First, as expected, depending on the strength of the correlation between X and Y (i.e., $\text{Cor}^2(Y, X)$), the use of a covariate has the potential to reduce the minimum required sample size; this is because the use of covariates may improve the efficiency of our estimator of β. Second, there is a reduction in sample size due to the reduction in correlation, ρ^*, which, by definition, is always less than ρ.

Using the Sample Size Formula for the ADEPT study

To exemplify how the formula can be utilized in practice, we calculate the sample size needed to detect a difference between DTRs (1,-1) and (-1,.) in ADEPT. This difference would help us understand if it is better to give REP+EF+IF to non-responding clinics initially, or to delay REP+EF+IF until a clinic is non-responsive to REP+EF. In ADEPT, we expect the ICC of patient's MH-QOL to be $\rho = .01$ and the probability of responding when initially receiving REP+EF to be $p_1 = .2$. Using the true sample size of $N = 60$, a common cluster size of $m = 10$, and performing an $\alpha = .05$ level test ($z_{\alpha/2} = 1.96$), by rearranging our formula, we conclude that at 80% power ($z_\beta = .84$) we can detect an effect size of δ = .282.

Simulations

Simulations were conducted to evaluate the developed formulae and understand their robustness to violations of the working assumptions. Specifically, we evaluate

formulae under four scenarios: (1) satisfying all working assumptions, (2) violating working assumption 1, (3) violating working assumption 2, and (4) violating working assumption 3. Here, we present results for ADEPT; results were similar for the prototypical SMART.

Details concerning the data generative model can be found in Appendix B. Data were generated to mimic the ADEPT study. We considered different data generative scenarios with varied standardized effect sizes (δ = .2 (small), .5 (moderate)), cluster sizes ($m = 5, 10, 20$), ICC (ρ or ρ^* = .01 or .1), and, when there is a cluster-level covariate, the correlation between X and Y ($\text{Cor}^2(Y, X) \in [.04, .4]$). We also considered different scenarios constituting violations of the working assumptions (details below). For each scenario, sample size was selected based on the proposed formulae with power $(1 - \beta)$ = .9, $\alpha = 0.05$. 1000 data sets were generated for each scenario.

Each data set was analyzed as in the Implementation and Standard Error Estimation sub-sections, using the marginal mean model in Equation 1. For each scenario, we compared the estimated power (over 1000 data sets) to nominal power of .9.

Table 3. Power analysis of Formula 5

ICC, ρ	Effect Size, δ	Cluster Size, m	Sample Size, N	Assumptions are correct	Violating Assumption 1	Violating Assumption 2
.01	.2	5	306	.894	.891	.886
		20	88	.917	.890	.876*
	.5	5	49	.909	.898	.880*
		10	26	.906	.878*	.893
.1	.2	5	412	.910	.901	.870*
		20	213	.922*	.902	.891
	.5	5	66	.909	.888	.898
		20	34	.915	.913	.889

*The proportion is significantly different from .9 at the 5% level.

Table 3 describes simulation results for the sample size formula in Equation 5. To violate assumption 1, we made the response variance under DTR$(1, b_2)$ 1.5 times the response variance under DTR $(-1, .)$. We could have also violated this assumption by deviating from an exchangeable covariance structure, however, in cluster-randomized trials it is rare to use an other covariance structure (Eldridge et al. 2009). To violate assumption 2, we made non-responders have significantly larger variance than responders under DTR $(1, b_2)$.

As expected, when no assumptions are violated (column 5), our estimated power is close to our pre-specified power, .9. When assumption 1 is violated (column 6) or assumption 2 is violated (column 7), we see that our power does not reduce dramatically. Hence, we conclude that our sample size formula is robust to violations of working assumptions 1 and 2.

Since working assumption 3 will always be true when there are no covariates, we run a second simulation to evaluate the robustness of the sample size formula in Equation 7 (i.e. with a cluster-level covariate) to this assumption. Specifically, to violate assumption 3, we deviate from the linear marginal mean in Equation 1 by generating data with $E_{a_1,a_2}(Y_{ij}|X_i) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 a_1 + \beta_2 a_2 I_{a_1=1} + \eta f_k(X_i)$ where

$f_k(X_i) = X_i$ for $X_i \in [-k, k]$, $f_k(X_i) = k$ for $X_i > k$, and $f_k(X_i) = -k$ for $X_i < -k$ (i.e. the linear marginal mean is misspecified outside of $[-k, k]$). Here η is chosen to maintain the same values of $\text{Cor}(Y, X)$. Setting $k = 2$ indicates a small violation (column 7) and setting $k = 1$ indicates a large violation (column 8). We still, however, analyze the data using the marginal mean model in Equation 1. The results are in Table 4.

Table 4. Power analysis of Formula 7

ICC, ρ^*	Effect Size, δ	Cluster Size, m	$\text{Cor}^2(Y, X)$	Sample Size, N	Assumptions are correct	Small Violation of Assumption 3	Large Violation of Assumption 3
.01	.2	5	.238	233	.909	.904	.859*
		20	.238	65	.903	.879*	.777*
	.5	5	.043	47	.891	.901	.902
		10	.066	24	.893	.903	.897
.1	.2	5	.243	305	.918	.900	.890
		20	.243	159	.915	.922*	.864*
	.5	5	.043	63	.898	.916	.919*
		20	.043	32	.908	.920*	.899

*The proportion is significantly different from .9 at the 5% level.

As expected, when no assumptions are violated (column 6), our estimated power is close to our pre-specified power, .9. Note the reduction in sample size caused by the addition of a covariate. Under a small violation (column 7), we see the power is not significantly reduced. Under a large violation (column 8), we see our power is lowest when X and Y are moderately correlated and the sample size is low. This is because when X and Y are weakly correlated, the overall influence of X is small, and hence misspecification of the relationship between X and Y will have little influence on our estimation and power.

Discussion and Future Work

This manuscript presents a regression estimator and sample size formulae for comparing embedded dynamic treatment regimens using data arising from a cluster-randomized SMART. Methods were motivated by the ADEPT SMART, a study designed to develop a dynamic treatment regimen (at the level of community based mental health clinics) designed to improve mental health outcomes for patients clustered within those sites (Kilbourne et al. 2014). Sample size formulae were derived for both ADEPT and for a more common type of SMART.

There are a number of directions for future research in the analysis of cluster-randomized SMARTs. First, relatively staightforward applications of the estimator in Equation 3 with different link functions can be used to analyze, for example, binary, count or zero-inflated outcomes.

Second, in practice, many cluster-randomized SMARTs will collect longitudinal (i.e., repeated measures) research outcomes at the patient-level. A natural next step is to combine the estimator presented here with methods for the analysis of longitudinal SMART outcomes (Lu et al. 2015) in order to accomodate two levels of clustering: repeated measures within patients within clusters.

Third, future work could also consider the use of variance components models, i.e., mixed effects or random effects models (Hedeker and Gibbons 2006; Raudenbush and Bryk 2002), which are now-standard in the analysis of randomized trials.

Fourth, while this manuscript focuses on the analysis of primary aims in a SMART, in the DTR literature there is much interest in the development and application of analysis methods designed to generate hypotheses about more individually-tailored DTRs (Zhao et al. 2015; Laber et al. 2014; Zhang et al. 2015; Laber and Zhao 2015; Linn et al. 2014; Qian and Murphy 2011; Moodie et al. 2014; Zhou et al. 2015). Much of this literature has focused on identifying optimal DTRs at the individual level. Such methods could be extended for the analysis of data arising from cluster-randomized SMARTs to develop optimal cluster-level DTRs.

There are also a number of interesting methodological issues related to the design of cluster-randomized SMARTs (with implications for analysis methods). First, the sample size formulae derived here were limited to cases where our data contains a single cluster-level covariate. Future work may provide extensions to data containing multiple covariates and individual-level covariates.

Second, in this manuscript we focus on SMARTs that are useful for developing of cluster-level DTRs where the initial and subsequent decisions are all at the cluster-level. However, there is currently much interest by educational scientists in SMARTs aimed at developing DTRs where sequences of intervention decisions are made at *both* the cluster and individual level. For example, we are currently involved in the conduct of a trial where the first stage intervention is at the level of classrooms with children with autism (such classrooms often include 1 to 3 children with autism), and the subsequent stages of intervention are at the level of the children themselves (Kasari et al. 2016).

Acknowledgements

R code for implementing the weighted least squares regression estimator and the sample size formulae for both ADEPT and the prototypical SMART are provided on the first author's website. This research is supported by the following NIH grants: R01MH099898 (Kilbourne & Almirall), P50DA039838 (Almirall), R01HD073975 (Almirall), R01DA039901 (Almirall). We also would like to thank Xi (Lucy) Lu for the helpful comments.

References

Almirall D, DiStefano C, Chang YC, Shire S, Kaiser A, Lu X, Nahum-Shani I, Landa R, Mathy P and Kasari C (2016) Longitudinal effects of adaptive interventions with a speech-generating device in minimally verbal children with asd. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology* : 1–15.

Almirall D, Nahum-Shani I, Sherwood N and Murphy S (2014) Introduction to SMART designs for the development of adaptive interventions: with application to weight loss research. *Translational Behavioral Medicine* (in press).

August GJ, Piehler TF and Bloomquist ML (2014) Being "smart" about adolescent conduct problems prevention: executing a smart pilot study in a juvenile diversion agency. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology* : 1–15.

Bembom O and van der Laan M (2007) Statistical methods for analyzing sequentially randomized trials. *Journal of the National Cancer Institute* 99(21): 1577–82.

Brumback BA (2009) A note on using the estimated versus the known propensity score to estimate the average treatment effect. *Statistics & Probability Letters* 79(4): 537–542.

Chakraborty B and Moodie E (2013) *Statistical methods for dynamic treatment regimes*. Springer.

Chronis-Tuscano A, Wang CH, Strickland J, Almirall D and Stein MA (2016) Personalized treatment of mothers with adhd and their young at-risk children: A smart pilot. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology* : 1–12.

Cohen J (1988) *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. 2nd edition. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.

Donner A and Klar N (2010) *Design and Analysis of Cluster Randomization Trials in Health Research*, volume 1. Wiley.

Eldridge SM, Ukoumunne OC and Carlin JB (2009) The intra-cluster correlation coefficient in cluster randomized trials: A review of definitions. *International Statistical Review* 77: 378–394.

Ghosh P, Cheung Y and Chakraborty B (2015) Sample size calculations for clustered smart designs. In: Kosorok MR and Moodie EE (eds.) *Adaptive Treatment Strategies in Practice: Planning Trials and Analyzing Data for Personalized Medicine*, chapter 5. Alexandria, Virginia: SIAM, pp. 55–70.

Gunlicks-Stoessel M, Mufson L, Westervelt A, Almirall D and Murphy S (2015) A pilot smart for developing an adaptive treatment strategy for adolescent depression. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology* : 1–15.

Hedeker D and Gibbons RD (2006) *Longitudinal data analysis*, volume 451. John Wiley & Sons.

Hedges L and Rhoads C (2009) *Statistical Power Analysis in Education Research*. National Center for Special Education Research, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. NCSER 2010-3006.

Hernán M, Brumback B and Robins J (2000) Marginal structural models to estimate the causal effect of zidovudine on the survival of hiv-positive men. *Epidemiology* 11(561-70).

Hernan M, Brumback B and Robins J (2002) Estimating the causal effect of zidovudine on cd4 count with a marginal structural model for repeated measures. *Statistics in Medicine* 21: 1689–1709.

Hirano K, Imbens GW and Ridder G (2003) Efficient estimation of average treatment effects using the estimated propensity score. *Econometrica* 71(4): 1161–1189.

Kasari C, Gulsrud A and Almirall D (2016) Getting SMART about Social and Academic Engagement of Elementary Aged Students with Autism Spectrum Disorder. URL http://ies.ed.gov/funding/grantsearch/details.asp?ID=1758.

Kasari C, Kaiser A, Goods K, Nietfeld J, Mathy P, Landa R, Murphy S and Almirall D (2014) Communication interventions for minimally verbal children with autism: Sequential multiple assignment randomized trial. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry* (in press).

Kerry SM and Bland MJ (2001) Unequal cluster sizes for trials in english and welsh general practice: implications for sample size calculations. *Statistics in Medicine* 20(3): 377–390.

Kilbourne AM, Abraham KM, Goodrich DE, Bowersox NW, Almirall D, Lai Z and Nord KM (2013) Cluster randomized adaptive implementation trial comparing a standard versus enhanced implementation intervention to improve uptake of an effective re-engagement program for patients with serious mental illness. *Implementation Science* 8(1): 1–14.

Kilbourne AM, Almirall D, Eisenberg D, Waxmonsky J, Goodrich DE, Fortney JC, Kirchner JE, Solberg LI, Main D, Bauer MS et al. (2014) Protocol: Adaptive implementation of effective programs trial (adept): cluster randomized smart trial comparing a standard versus enhanced implementation strategy to improve outcomes of a mood disorders program. *Implement Science* 9: 132.

Kilbourne AM, Goodrich DE, Lai Z, Clogston J, Waxmonsky J and Bauer MS (2012) Life goals collaborative care for patients with bipolar disorder and cardiovascular disease risk. *Psychiatric Services* .

Kosorok MR and Moodie EE (2015) *Adaptive Treatment Strategies in Practice: Planning Trials and Analyzing Data for Personalized Medicine*, volume 21. SIAM.

Laber E, Zhao Y, Regh T, Davidian M, Tsiatis AA, Stanford JB, Zeng D and Kosorok MR (2014) Sizing a phase ii trial to find a nearly optimal personalized treatment strategy .

Laber EB and Zhao Y (2015) Tree-based methods for individualized treatment regimes. *Biometrika* 102(3): 501–514.

Lavori P and Dawson D (2000) A design for testing clinical strategies: biased individually tailored within-subject randomization. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series A* 163: 29–38.

Lavori PW and Dawson R (2014) Introduction to dynamic treatment strategies and sequential multiple assignment randomization. *Clinical Trials* 11(4): 393–399.

Lei H, Nahum-Shani I, Lynch K, Oslin D and Murphy S (2012) A SMART design for building individualized treatment sequences. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology* 8: 21–48.

Li Z and Murphy SA (2011) Sample size formulae for two-stage randomized trials with survival outcomes. *Biometrika* 98(3): 503–518.

Liang KY and Zeger SL (1986) Longitudinal data analysis using generalized linear models. *Biometrika* 73(1): 13–22.

Liang KY and Zeger SL (1993) Regression analysis for correlated data. *Annual review of public health* 14(1): 43–68.

Linn KA, Laber EB and Stefanski LA (2014) Interactive q-learning for probabilities and quantiles. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1407.3414* .

Lu X, Lynch KG, Oslin DW and Murphy S (2015) Comparing treatment policies with assistance from the structural nested mean model. *Biometrics* .

Lu X, Nahum-Shani I, Kasari C, Lynch KG, Oslin DW, Pelham WE, Fabiano G and Almirall D (2016) Comparing dynamic treatment regimes using repeated-measures outcomes: modeling considerations in smart studies. *Statistics in Medicine* 35(10): 1595–1615. DOI:10.1002/sim.6819. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/sim.6819. Sim.6819.

McKay JR, Drapkin ML, Van Horn DH, Lynch KG, Oslin DW, DePhilippis D, Ivey M and Cacciola JS (2015) Effect of patient choice in an adaptive sequential randomization trial of treatment for alcohol and cocaine dependence. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology* 83(6): 1021.

Methodology Center (2016) Example SMART studies. URL https://methodology.psu.edu/ra/adap-inter/projects.

Moodie EE, Dean N and Sun YR (2014) Q-learning: Flexible learning about useful utilities. *Statistics in Biosciences* 6(2): 223–243.

Murphy S (2005) An experimental design for the development of adaptive treatment strategies. *Statistics in Medicine* 24: 1455–1481.

Murphy SA, van der Laan MJ, Robins JM and CPPRG (2001) Marginal mean models for dynamic regimes. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 96: 1410–1423.

Murray DM (1998) *Design and analysis of group-randomized trials*, volume 29. Oxford University Press, USA.

Naar-King S, Ellis DA, Idalski Carcone A, Templin T, Jacques-Tiura AJ, Brogan Hartlieb K, Cunningham P and Jen KLC (2015) Sequential multiple assignment randomized trial (smart) to construct weight loss interventions for african american adolescents. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology* : 1–14.

Nahum-Shani I, Qian M, Almirall D, Pelham W, Gnagy B, Fabiano G, Waxmonsky J, Yu J and Murphy S (2012) Experimental design and primary data analysis methods for comparing adaptive interventions. *Psychological Methods* 17: 457–477.

Neyman J, Iwaszkiewicz K and Kolodziejczyk S (1935) Statistical problems in agricultural experimentation. *Supplement to the Journal of the Royal Statistical Society* (107-80).

Oetting A, Levy J, Weiss R and Murphy S (2011) Statistical methodology for a smart design in the development of adaptive treatment strategies. In: Shrout P, Keyes K and Ornstein K (eds.) *Causality and psychopathology: Finding the determinants of disorders and their cures*. Arlington, VA: Oxford University Press, pp. 179–205.

Orellana L, Rotnitzky A and Robins J (2010) Dynamic regime marginal structural mean models for estimating optimal dynamic treatment regimes, part i: Main content. *International Journal of Biostatistics* 6(2): Article 8.

Pelham WE, Fabiano GA, Waxmonsky JG, Greiner AR, Gnagy EM, Pelham WE, Coxe S, Verley J, Bhatia I, Hart K et al. (2016) Treatment sequencing for childhood adhd: A multiple-randomization study of adaptive medication and behavioral interventions. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology* : 1–20.

Qian M and Murphy SA (2011) Performance guarantees for individualized treatment rules. *Annals of statistics* 39(2): 1180.

Raudenbush SW and Bryk AS (2002) *Hierarchical linear models: Applications and data analysis methods*, volume 1. Sage.

Robins J (1997) Causal inference from complex longitudinal data. In: *Latent Variable Modeling and Applications to Causality.*, Lecture Notes in Statistics. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Robins JM (1999) Association, causation, and marginal structural models. *Synthese* 121: 151–179.

Robins JM, Hernan M and Brumback B (2000) Marginal structural models and causal inference. *Epidemiology* 11(5): 550–560.

Robins JM, Rotnitzky A and Zhao LP (1995) Analysis of semiparametric regression models for repeated outcomes in the presence of missing data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 90(429): 106–121.

Rubin DB (1978) Bayesian inference for causal effects: The role of randomization. *The Annals of Statistics* 6: 34–58.

Sherwood NE, Butryn ML, Forman EM, Almirall D, Seburg EM, Crain AL, Kunin-Batson AS, Hayes MG, Levy RL and Jeffery RW (2016) The bestfit trial: A smart approach to developing individualized weight loss treatments. *Contemporary clinical trials* 47: 209–216.

Spybrook J, Bloom H, Congdon R, Hill C, Martinez A and Raudenbush S (2011) Optimal Design Plus Empirical Evidence. URL http://wtgrantfoundation.org/resource/optimal-design-with-empirical-information-od.

Williamson EJ, Forbes A and White IR (2014) Variance reduction in randomised trials by inverse probability weighting using the propensity score. *Statistics in medicine* 33(5): 721–737.

Zhang Y, Laber EB, Tsiatis A and Davidian M (2015) Using decision lists to construct interpretable and parsimonious treatment regimes. *Biometrics* 71(4): 895–904.

Zhao YQ, Zeng D, Laber EB and Kosorok MR (2015) New statistical learning methods for estimating optimal dynamic treatment regimes. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 110(510): 583–598.

Zhou X, Mayer-Hamblett N, Khan U and Kosorok MR (2015) Residual weighted learning for estimating individualized treatment rules. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* (just-accepted): 00–00.

Appendix A: Derivation of Sample Size Formulae

Here we derive the sample size formula. We begin with deriving the sample size formula for a prototypical design with no covariates. Then we make simple extensions to formula under an ADEPT design and/or when a cluster-level covariate is included. All sample size formulae are based primary aim (iv), that is the marginal mean comparison of two dynamic treatment regimens that begin with a different initial treatment (i.e., $E_{1,b_2}(Y_{ij}) - E_{\text{-}1,c_2}(Y_{ij})$).

Also, for simplicity, these derivations assume the marginal mean model is parameterized as follows:

For Prototypical:

$$\mu(X_{ij}, a_1, a_2; \beta, \eta) = \beta_0 I\{a_1 = 1, a_2 = 1\} + \beta_1 I\{a_1 = 1, a_2 = -1\} +$$

$$\beta_2 I\{a_1 = -1, a_2 = 1\} + \beta_3 I\{a_1 = -1, a_2 = -1\} + \eta^T X_{ij}$$

For ADEPT:

$$\mu(X_{ij}, a_1, a_2) = \beta_0 I\{a_1 = 1, a_2 = 1\} + \beta_1 I\{a_1 = 1, a_2 = -1\} +$$

$$\beta_2 I\{a_1 = -1\} + \eta^T X_{ij}$$

Fitting the re-parameterized models will yield the exact same conclusions as fitting the marginal mean models in Equations 1 and 2.

Prototypical Design without Covariates

For data arising from a prototypical SMART design, we derive the sample size formula for detecting a significant difference between mean outcomes from two treatment regimens, (b_1, b_2) and (c_1, c_2). Since we are interested in comparing two regimes starting with different initial treatment. Hence, without loss of generality, assume $b_1 = 1$ and $c_1 = $ -1.

We are interested in the following hypothesis test:

$$H_0 : E_{1,b_2}(Y_{ij}) - E_{\text{-}1,c_2}(Y_{ij}) = 0$$

against the alternative

$$H_1 : E_{1,b_2}(Y_{ij}) - E_{\text{-}1,c_2}(Y_{ij}) = \delta\sigma$$

where $\sigma = \sqrt{\frac{\sigma^2_{1,b_2} + \sigma^2_{\text{-}1,c_2}}{2}}$, $\sigma^2_{a_1,a_2} = \text{Var}_{a_1,a_2}(Y_{ij})$, and δ is the standardized effect size.

We make a series of assumptions to derive our sample size formulae. We highlight these assumptions throughout our derivation to illustrate there use in the calculation. Note that our sample size is developed for a fixed cluster size, m (extensions to the unequal cluster size case can be done as in Kerry and Bland (2001)).

Our test statistic used for the hypothesis test is

$$Z = \frac{\sqrt{N}(\hat{\mu}(1, b_2) - \hat{\mu}(\text{-}1, c_2))}{\sqrt{\hat{\tau}^2(1, b_2) + \hat{\tau}^2(\text{-}1, c_2) - 2\widehat{Cov}(\sqrt{N}\hat{\mu}(1, b_2), \sqrt{N}\hat{\mu}(\text{-}1, c_2))}}$$

Here, $\hat{\tau}^2(a_1, a_2)$ is an approximation of the variance, $\tau^2(a_1, a_2)$ = Var$(\sqrt{N}\hat{\mu}(a_1, a_2))$ as given in the supplementary material.

In large samples and under assumption 3 described in the Sample Size Formulae section, the distributions of $\hat{\mu}(1, b_2)$ and $\hat{\mu}(\text{-}1, c_2)$ can be approximated by the normal distribution, $\hat{\tau}^2(1, b_2) \approx \tau^2(1, b_2)$, $\hat{\tau}^2(\text{-}1, c_2) \approx \tau^2(\text{-}1, c_2)$, and $\widehat{Cov}(\sqrt{N}\hat{\mu}(1, b_2), \sqrt{N}\hat{\mu}(\text{-}1, c_2)) \approx Cov(\sqrt{N}\hat{\mu}(1, b_2), \sqrt{N}\hat{\mu}(\text{-}1, c_2)) = 0$ (here the covariance is 0 due to the independence of estimators of marginal means with different initial treatments). Thus, Z approximately has a standard normal distribution under the null hypothesis.

Note that these calculations are exactly the same as those highlighted in the Hypothesis Testing section. Specifically, under the original parameterization, letting $c = (0, 2, b_2 - c_2, b_2 + c_2, 0_p)^T$ then $c^T(\hat{\beta}, \hat{\eta}) = \hat{\mu}(1, b_2) - \hat{\mu}(\text{-}1, c_2)$ and $c\hat{\Sigma}_{\hat{\beta},\hat{\eta}}\, c^T = \hat{\tau}^2(1, b_2) + \hat{\tau}^2(\text{-}1, c_2) - 2\widehat{Cov}(\sqrt{N}\hat{\mu}(1, b_2), \sqrt{N}\hat{\mu}(\text{-}1, c_2))$.

Under the alternative, our test statistic is normal with approximate mean $\sqrt{N}\delta\sigma / \sqrt{\tau^2(1, b_2) + \tau^2(\text{-}1, c_2)}$ and variance 1. Doing standard power calculations (Oetting et al. 2011) for a hypothesis test of size α, in order to obtain desired power of $1 - \beta$, we need to find N that satisfies:

$$z_\beta \approx -z_{\alpha/2} + \frac{\delta\sigma\sqrt{N}}{\sqrt{\tau^2(1, b_2) + \tau^2(\text{-}1, c_2)}}$$

$$N = \frac{(z_\beta + z_{\alpha/2})^2(\tau^2(1, b_2) + \tau^2(\text{-}1, c_2))}{\delta^2\sigma^2} \tag{9}$$

Everything in this formula can be explicitly found except $\tau^2(1, b_2)$ and $\tau^2(\text{-}1, c_2)$. Hence we now aim to derive upper bounds for these variables in order to write our sample size formula in terms of either known or easily elicited quantities.

Note that under the parameterization, for any DTR (a_1, a_2), $\tau^2(a_1, a_2) = \text{Var}[\sqrt{N}\hat{\mu}(a_1, a_2)] = [\Sigma_{\hat{\beta}}]_{(a_1,a_2)} = [J^{\text{-}1}E[U_iU_i^T]J^{\text{-}1}]_{(a_1,a_2)}$, with U_i and J defined in the supplementary material. Here, for ease, for the 4x4 matrices, M = $\Sigma_{\hat{\beta}}$, J, or E$[U_iU_i^T]$, we define $[M]_{(a_1,a_2)}$ as the diagonal element corresponding to DTR (a_1, a_2) (e.g. the (3,3) element for DTR $(-1, 1)$). Also, 1_m is defined as the mx1 vector of 1's. Lastly, as defined in the Sample Size Formulae section, p_{a_1} is the probability of responding given the cluster had received initial treatment a_1.

After simplification, we find J is a diagonal matrix with diagonal element:

$$[J]_{(a_1,a_2)} = E[W_iI_{i(a_1,a_2)}1_m^TV^{\text{-}1}(a_1, a_2)1_m] = 1_m^TV^{\text{-}1}(a_1, a_2)1_m$$

For $E[U_iU_i^T]_{(a_1,a_2)}$, we perform the following simplification:

$$E[U_iU_i^T]_{(a_1,a_2)} =$$

$$E[W_i^2I_{i(a_1,a_2)}1_m^TV^{\text{-}1}(a_1, a_2)(\mathbf{Y}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}(a_1, a_2))(\mathbf{Y}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}(a_1, a_2))^TV^{\text{-}1}(a_1, a_2)1_m] =$$

$$1_m^TV^{\text{-}1}(a_1, a_2)E_{a_1,a_2}[W_i(\mathbf{Y}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}(a_1, a_2))(\mathbf{Y}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}(a_1, a_2))^T]V^{\text{-}1}(a_1, a_2)1_m =$$

$$1_m^TV^{\text{-}1}(a_1, a_2)[2E_{a_1,a_2}[(\mathbf{Y}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}(a_1, a_2))(\mathbf{Y}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}(a_1, a_2))^T|R = 1]p_{a_1} +$$

$$4E_{a_1,a_2}[(\mathbf{Y}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}(a_1, a_2))(\mathbf{Y}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}(a_1, a_2))^T|R = 0](1 - p_{a_1})]V^{\text{-}1}(a_1, a_2)1_m =$$

$$2 * 1_m^TV^{\text{-}1}(a_1, a_2)\Sigma_{a_1,a_2}V^{\text{-}1}(a_1, a_2)1_m +$$

$$2(1 - p_{a_1}) * 1_m^TV^{\text{-}1}(a_1, a_2)E_{a_1,a_2}[(\mathbf{Y}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}(a_1, a_2))(\mathbf{Y}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}(a_1, a_2))^T|R = 0]$$

$$\cdot V^{\text{-}1}(a_1, a_2)1_m$$

To go from line 2 to 3, we assume Robin's consistency assumption holds, i.e. that the cluster's observed outcomes equal the cluster's potential outcomes under the observed DTR (Robins 1997). Under this assumption we are able to switch from E, which is an expected value over observed data, to E_{a_1,a_2} which is the expected value had the entire population received DTR (a_1, a_2) (Rubin 1978; Neyman et al. 1935).

For further simplification, we now make assumption 2. This assumption is equivalent to assuming, for a specific DTR (a_1, a_2) (we drop the a_1, a_2 from the subscripts for convenience): $|(\sigma_R^2\rho_R - \sigma_{NR}^2\rho_{NR})p_{a_1} + (\mu_R - \mu_{NR})^2(p_{a_1})(1 - 2p_{a_1})| \leq (\sigma_R^2 - \sigma_{NR}^2)p_{a_1} + (\mu_R - \mu_{NR})^2(p_{a_1})(1 - 2p_{a_1})$, where $\mu_R, \sigma_R^2, \rho_R$ are the mean, variance, and ICC of responders had the whole population received DTR (a_1, a_2), (i.e. $\mu_R = E_{a_1,a_2}(Y_{ij}|R_i = 1), \sigma_R^2 = \text{Var}_{a_1,a_2}(Y_{ij}|R_i = 1), \rho_R = \text{Cov}_{a_1,a_2}(Y_{i1}, Y_{i2}|R_i = 1)/\text{Var}_{a_1,a_2}(Y_{ij}|R_i = 1)$), similarly defined for NR and non-responders (i.e. conditional on R = 0). Also, p_{a_1} is the probability of response, given initial treatment a_1.

For DTR (a_1, a_2), this condition is satisfied if the probability of response is less than or equal to .5 (which is typical for prototypical SMART designs), the non-responders of that regimen have a variance which is less than or equal to the variance of responders

of the regimen, and both responders and non-responders have similar within cluster covariances.

Under assumption 2 we can bound and simplify our expression for $E[U_i U_i^T]_{(a_1,a_2)}$ as

$$E[U_i U_i^T]_{(a_1,a_2)} \preceq$$

$$2(1+(1-p_{a_1})) * 1_m^T V^{-1}(a_1,a_2)\Sigma_{a_1,a_2} V^{-1}(a_1,a_2) 1_m$$

We next utilize the fact that our working covariance matrix, V, is exchangeable. With some linear algebra, this assumption allows us to perform the following simplification: $\frac{2(2-p_{a_1})1_m^T V^{-1}(a_1,a_2)\Sigma_{a_1,a_2} V^{-1}(a_1,a_2)1_m}{(1_m^T V^{-1}(a_1,a_2)1_m)^2} = \frac{2(2-p_{a_1})1_m^T \Sigma_{a_1,a_2} 1_m}{m^2}$

Next, using assumption 1, we exploit the exchangeable population covariance structure (i.e. $\text{Cov}_{a_1,a_2}(\mathbf{Y}_i) = \sigma^2_{a_1,a_2} * Exch(\rho_{a_1,a_2})$, where $\rho_{a_1,a_2} = \text{Cor}_{a_1,a_2}(Y_{i1}, Y_{i2})$). Putting everything together, we obtain:

$$\tau^2(a_1,a_2) = \text{Var}[\sqrt{N}\hat{\mu}(a_1,a_2)] \overset{3}{=} [J^{-1}E[U_i U_i^T]J^{-1}]_{(a_1,a_2)} \overset{2}{\leq}$$

$$\frac{2(2-p_{a_1})1_m^T V^{-1}(a_1,a_2)\Sigma_{a_1,a_2} V^{-1}(a_1,a_2)1_m}{(1_m^T V^{-1}(a_1,a_2)1_m)^2} = \frac{2(2-p_{a_1})1_m^T \Sigma_{a_1,a_2} 1_m}{m^2} \overset{1}{=}$$

$$\frac{2(2-p_{a_1})\sigma^2_{a_1,a_2}[1+(m-1)\rho_{a_1,a_2}]}{m} \tag{10}$$

We utilize the across regimen covariance equality of assumption 1 in order to simplify things further. Note that if one had good estimates of $\sigma^2_{a_1,a_2}$ and ρ_{a_1,a_2}, then you could easily obtain N by plugging in the values into equation 10 and then using these estimates in equation 9.

Using this equality, we combine equation 10 with equation 9 and simplify to obtain:

$$N = \frac{4(z_\beta + z_{\alpha/2})^2}{m\delta^2} \cdot (1+(m-1)\rho) \cdot (1 + \frac{(1-p_1)+(1-p_{\text{-1}})}{2})$$

ADEPT Design without Covariates

All the calculations done above are nearly identical for the ADEPT case. The only major difference arises from the lack of re-randomization of clusters receiving initial treatment $a_1 = -1$. This in fact makes the calculations simpler for $\tau^2(-1,.)$ In particular, we assume assumptions 1 and 3, however, assumption 2 only needs to be assumed for DTR (1,b_2). Under these assumptions we obtain:

$$\tau^2(1,b_2) \leq \frac{2(2-p_1)\sigma^2_{1,b_2}[1+(m-1)\rho_{1,b_2}]}{m}, \tau^2(\text{-1},.) = \frac{2\sigma^2_{\text{-1},.}[1+(m-1)\rho_{\text{-1},.}]}{m} \tag{11}$$

After utilizing the across regimen population covariance equality of assumption 1, we combine the equation 11 with equation 9 and simplify to obtain:

$$N = \frac{4(z_\beta + z_{\alpha/2})^2}{m\delta^2} \cdot (1+(m-1)\rho) \cdot (1 + \frac{1-p_1}{2})$$

For this sample size formula, we actually only need to assume $\sigma^2_{1,b_2} \leq \sigma^2_{-1,\cdot}$ (as opposed to the equality assumed in assumption 1) to ensure our power is larger than 1 - β.

With a Cluster-Level Covariate

In this section, we write the sample size formula when adding a single cluster-level covariate to the model (i.e. the mx1 vector $\mathbf{X}_i \triangleq (X_{i1}, X_{i2}, \ldots, X_{im})^T = (X_i, X_i, \ldots, X_i)^T$). First, for DTR (a_1, a_2), we define $\sigma^{2*}_{a_1,a_2} \triangleq E_{a_1,a_2}[\text{Var}_{a_1,a_2}(Y_{ij}|X_i)]$, and $\rho^*_{a_1,a_2} \triangleq E_{a_1,a_2}[\text{Cov}_{a_1,a_2}(Y_{i1}, Y_{i2}|X_i)]/\sigma^{2*}_{a_1,a_2}$, where the expectations are taken over X_i. Note in the homoscedastic case, the expectation is unnecessary since the conditional variances and covariances are constant for all X_i.

The key to extending our formulae to the covariate case is observing that the numerator of our sample size formula will now be in terms of the average *conditional* variances and ICCs, $\sigma^{2*}_{a_1,a_2}$ and $\rho^*_{a_1,a_2}$, while the denominator remains in terms of the overall variance, $\sigma^2_{a_1,a_2}$. Since $\sigma^2_{a_1,a_2} = \sigma^{2*}_{a_1,a_2} + \eta^2 Var(X_i)$ and $\text{Cov}_{a_1,a_2}(Y_{i1}, Y_{i2}) = E_{a_1,a_2}[\text{Cov}_{a_1,a_2}(Y_{i1}, Y_{i2}|X_i)] + \eta^2 Var(X_i)$, then $\sigma^{2*}_{a_1,a_2}$ and $\rho^*_{a_1,a_2}$ must be less than or equal to $\sigma^2_{a_1,a_2}$ and ρ_{a_1,a_2}. Thus the numerator of our formula is reduced while the denominator remains the same. With some algebra, this reduction is shown to be $1 - \text{Cor}^2(Y_{ij}, X_i)$. Note that this reduction can be shown to be the same reduction arising from including a cluster-level covariate in clustered RCTs, see Hedges and Rhoads (2009).

For simplification, we do all calculations assuming our covariate has mean 0 (this eliminates covariance between our marginal mean estimates). When our covariate does not have mean 0, one can show that mean centering our covariate does not change the value of our test statistic, and hence does not change our power. Thus our sample size formula remains valid when the covariate does not have mean 0.

Prototypical Design Using assumptions 1-3, the relationships above, and doing similar algebra as in the non-covariate case (except now everything is in terms of $\sigma^{2*}_{a_1,a_2}$ and $\rho^*_{a_1,a_2}$), we obtain for both DTRs of interest:

$$\tau^2(a_1, a_2) \leq \frac{2(2 - p_1)\sigma^{2*}_{a_1,a_2}[1 + (m-1)\rho^*_{a_1,a_2}]}{m} \tag{12}$$

Making assumption 1 (on unconditional population variances and correlations) will lead to equality of expected conditional variances and correlations due to the simple relationship between the conditional and unconditional variances and covariances highlighted above. Hence we define $\rho^* \triangleq \rho^*_{1,b_2} = \rho^*_{-1,c_2}$ and $\sigma^{2*} \triangleq \sigma^{2*}_{1,b_2} = \sigma^{2*}_{\text{-1},c_2}$.

We also take advantage of the fact that $\text{Cor}^2_{1,b_2}(Y_{ij}, X_i) = \eta^2 \text{Var}(X_i)/\sigma^2_{1,b_2} = \eta^2 \text{Var}(X_i)/\sigma^2_{-1,c_2}$, i.e. is also equal across both regimes. We define $\text{Cor}^2(Y, X) \triangleq \text{Cor}^2_{1,b_2}(Y_{ij}, X_i) = \text{Cor}^2_{-1,c_2}(Y_{ij}, X_i)$.

Ultimately, we obtain :

$$N = \frac{4(z_\beta + z_{\alpha/2})^2}{m\delta^2}(1 + (m-1)\rho^*)(1 + \frac{(1-p_1) + (1-p_{\text{-1}})}{2})[1 - \text{Cor}^2(Y, X)]$$

ADEPT Design Similar to the prototypical design, under assumptions 1-3, for DTR (1, b_2) we obtain the same bound as in equation 12. For DTR (-1, .), without utilizing assumption 2, we obtain:

$$\tau^2(-1,.) = \frac{2\sigma^{2*}_{-1,.}[1+(m-1)\rho^*_{-1,.}]}{m}$$

And, utilizing equality of population covariance across regimens:

$$N = \frac{4(z_\beta + z_{\alpha/2})^2}{m\delta^2}(1+(m-1)\rho^*)(1+\frac{1-p_1}{2})[1-\text{Cor}^2(Y,X)]$$

Also, with some algebra, ρ^* can be expressed as $\rho^* = (\rho - \text{Cor}^2(Y,X))/(1-\text{Cor}^2(Y,X))$, allowing our two covariate sample size formulae to be a function purely of ρ and Cor^2(Y,X).

Appendix B: Data-generative Models Used in Simulation Experiments

Below we describe how we generated data for our simulations.

Without Covariates

For Table 3, we generate data, (A_1, R, A_2, Y), for each of the N clusters as follows:

1. Generate A_1 to be 1 or -1 with equal probability
2. Generate R to be 1 with probability p_{A_1} and 0 otherwise
3. Generate A_2 to be 1 or -1 with equal probability, for clusters with $A_1 = 1, R = 0$
4. Generate the mx1 vector $Y = \mu_{A_1,R,A_2} + \epsilon$, where $\epsilon \sim$ MVN$(0, \Sigma_{A_1,R,A_2})$, where $\Sigma_{A_1,R,A_2} = \sigma^2_{A_1,R,A_2} \cdot Exch_m(\rho_{A_1,R,A_2})$. Here μ_{A_1,R,A_2}, $\sigma^2_{A_1,R,A_2}$, ρ_{A_1,R,A_2} are the cell means, variances, and ICCs since they correspond to each cell in Figure 1.

Table 5. Pre-specified simulation values for Table 3

Simulation	p_1	p_{-1}	$\mu_{1,1,.}$	$\mu_{1,0,1}$	$\mu_{1,0,-1}$	$\mu_{-1,1,.}$	$\mu_{-1,0,.}$	$\sigma^2_{1,1,.}$	
Table 3, Row 1, Col 5	.2	.3	34.71	32.71	28	32.7	31	63.36	
Table 3, Row 1, Col 6	.2	.3	34.71	32.71	28	32.14	31.44	63.36	
Table 3, Row 1, Col 7	.2	.3	33.36	33.05	28	32.7	31	1	
Simulation	$\sigma^2_{1,0,1}$	$\sigma^2_{1,0,-1}$	$\sigma^2_{-1,1,.}$	$\sigma^2_{-1,0,.}$	$\rho_{1,1,.}$	$\rho_{1,0,1}$	$\rho_{1,0,-1}$	$\rho_{-1,1,.}$	$\rho_{-1,0,.}$
Table 3, Row 1, Col 5	63.36	60	63.39	63.39	0.0	0.0	0.0	.0006	.0006
Table 3, Row 1, Col 6	63.36	60	43	43	0.0	0.0	0.0	.0076	.0076
Table 3, Row 1, Col 7	79.73	60	63.39	63.39	0.9	.007	0.0	.0006	.0006

Under these specified means, variances, and ICCs, one can easily obtain the desired marginal (over R) means, variances, and ICCs under a specific DTR using the laws of total expectation and variation. For example, to obtain the marginal mean under DTR (1,1), one would calculate $\mu_{1,1,.}p_1 + \mu_{1,0,1}(1-p_1)$. To calculate the variance under DTR (1,1), one would calculate $\sigma^2_{1,1,.}p_1 + \sigma^2_{1,0,1}(1-p_1) + p_1(1-$

$p_1)(\mu_{1,1,.} - \mu_{1,0,1})^2$. To calculate the covariance under DTR (1,1), one would calculate $\sigma^2_{1,1,.}\rho_{1,1,.}p_1 + \sigma^2_{1,0,1}\rho_{1,0,1}(1-p_1) + p_1(1-p_1)(\mu_{1,1,.} - \mu_{1,0,1})^2$

When no assumptions were violated (row 1 of Table 5), the cell means and variances were first chosen to give marginal means and variances which are both similar to results expected in ADEPT and produce effect sizes matching Table 3. After obtaining the correct effect size, the cell ICCs were then chosen also to match values specified in Table 3. To violate assumptions (row 2 and 3 of Table 5), the cell means, variances, and ICCs from row 1 were slightly altered to create the correct violations.

With a Cluster-Level Covariate

To generate data for Table 4, we use a continuous cluster-level covariate. We generate data, (X, A_1, R, A_2, Y), for each of the N clusters as follows:

1. Generate A_1 to be 1 or -1 with equal probability
2. Generate R to be 1 with probability p_{A_1} and 0 otherwise
3. Generate A_2 to be 1 or -1 with equal probability, for clusters with $A_1 = 1, R = 0$
4. Generate a single cluster-level covariate X from Normal(0,1)
5. a. Generate mx1 vector $Y = \mu_{A_1,R,A_2} + \eta X + \epsilon$ for Column 6
   b. Generate mx1 vector $Y = \mu_{A_1,R,A_2} + \eta f_k(X) + \epsilon$ for Columns 7, 8

   where $\epsilon \sim$ MVN$(0, \Sigma_{A_1,R,A_2})$, with $\Sigma_{A_1,R,A_2} = \sigma^{2*}_{A_1,R,A_2} \cdot Exch_m(\rho^*_{A_1,R,A_2})$. Here μ_{A_1,R,A_2}, $\sigma^{2*}_{A_1,R,A_2}$, $\rho^*_{A_1,R,A_2}$ are the cell means, conditional cell variances, and conditional cell ICCs since they correspond to each cell in Figure 1. Also, f_k is the same piecewise function defined in the Simulations section (i.e. which is non-linear outside of $[-k, k]$).

Table 6. Pre-specified simulation values for Table 4

Simulation	k	p_1	$p_{\cdot 1}$	η	$\mu_{1,1,.}$	$\mu_{1,0,1}$	$\mu_{1,0,-1}$	$\mu_{-1,1,.}$	$\mu_{-1,0,.}$	$\sigma^{2*}_{1,1,.}$
Table 4, Row 1, Col 6		.2	.3	4.47	34.94	32.94	28	32.7	31	63.36
Table 4, Row 1, Col 7	2	.2	.3	4.69	34.95	32.95	28	32.7	31	63.36
Table 4, Row 1, Col 8	1	.2	.3	6.66	34.98	32.98	28	32.7	31	63.36

Simulation	$\sigma^{2*}_{1,0,1}$	$\sigma^{2*}_{1,0,-1}$	$\sigma^{2*}_{-1,1,.}$	$\sigma^{2*}_{-1,0,.}$	$\rho^*_{1,1,.}$	$\rho^*_{1,0,1}$	$\rho^*_{1,0,-1}$	$\rho^*_{-1,1,.}$	$\rho^*_{-1,0,.}$
Table 4, Row 1, Col 6	63.36	60	63.39	63.39	0.0	0.0	0.0	.0006	.0006
Table 4, Row 1, Col 7	63.36	60	63.39	63.39	0.0	0.0	0.0	.0006	.0006
Table 4, Row 1, Col 8	63.36	60	63.39	63.39	0.0	0.0	0.0	.0006	.0006

Under these specified conditional means, variances, and ICCs, one can again obtain the desired conditional and unconditional marginal means, variances, and ICCs under a specific DTR using the laws of total expectation and variation. For example, to obtain the conditional marginal variance under DTR (1,1), one would calculate $\sigma^{2*}_{1,1} = \sigma^{2*}_{1,1,.}p_1 + \sigma^{2*}_{1,0,1}(1-p_1) + p_1(1-p_1)(\mu_{1,1,.} - \mu_{1,0,1})^2$. For data generated as in 5a, to obtain the unconditional marginal variance under DTR (1,1), one would calculate $\sigma^2_{1,1} = \sigma^{2*}_{1,1} + \eta^2 \text{Var}(X)$. For data generated as in 5b, we instead calculate $\sigma^2_{1,1} = \sigma^{2*}_{1,1} + \eta^2 \text{Var}(f_k(X))$. Both Var$(X)$ and Var$(f_k(X))$ can be found using the known distribution of X.

The cell means, conditional variances, and conditional ICCs were chosen for the same reason as in the non-covariate case. η was chosen to give the correct correlation between X and Y.

Supplementary Materials

Asymptotic results for the estimator

This section shows consistency and asymptotic normality of the proposed estimator. These proofs are similar to those found in Lu et al. (2016). In Equation 3 the estimator was presented with fixed working covariance matrices, $V(a_1, a_2, m_i)$, and known weights, W_i. However, in practice $V(a_1, a_2, m_i)$ must be estimated and the known weights can be estimated to improve efficiency, see Robins et al. (1995); Hernan et al. (2002); Hirano et al. (2003); Brumback (2009); Williamson et al. (2014); Bembom and van der Laan (2007). Additionally, we may want the covariance matrices to be functions of baseline covariates. We also may want to allow weights to depend on baseline covariates, $\mathbf{X}_i$, information collected prior to first randomization, L_{0i}, and information collected between the first and second randomization, L_{1i}. Specifically, we allow $W_i = 1/(Pr(A_{1i}|\mathbf{X}_i, \mathrm{L}_{0i})Pr(A_{2i}|\mathbf{X}_i, \mathrm{L}_{0i}, A_{1i}, \mathrm{L}_{1i}, R_i))$. We represent $V(a_1, a_2, m_i)$ and W_i by $V(\mathbf{X}_i, a_1, a_2, m_i; \hat{\alpha})$ and $W_i(\hat{\gamma})$, where $\hat{\alpha}$ and $\hat{\gamma}$ arise from estimation of V and W. We also allow for cluster sizes to be unequal across observations since this is typical in practice. Under these general settings, the estimating equation is:

$$0 = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{(a_1,a_2)} I(A_{1i}, R_i, A_{2i}, a_1, a_2)W_i(\hat{\gamma}) \cdot D(\mathbf{X}_i, a_1, a_2)^T V(\mathbf{X}_i, a_1, a_2, m_i; \hat{\alpha})^{-1}(\mathbf{Y}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{X}_i, a_1, a_2; \beta, \eta)), \tag{13}$$

We first demonstrate the consistency of the estimator found by solving this equation.

Theorem 1. *Assume the marginal model is correctly specified, that is, $E_{a_1,a_2}[Y_{ij}|X_{ij}] = \mu(X_{ij}, a_1, a_2; \beta_0, \eta_0)$, where (β_0, η_0) is the true value for the parameter (β, η) in the marginal mean model. Assume Y_{ij} is conditionally independent of X_{ik} $\forall k \neq j$ given X_{ij}. Also assume that there exists α^+, γ_0 such that $\sqrt{N}(\hat{\alpha} - \alpha^+) = O_p(1)$ and $\sqrt{N}(\hat{\gamma} - \gamma_0) = O_p(1)$ (i.e. are bounded in probability), where $W_i(\gamma_0) \equiv W_i$, the true inverse-probability weight. Then the estimator $(\hat{\beta}, \hat{\eta})$ obtained by solving Equation 13 is consistent for (β_0, η_0).*

Proof. Define $\theta = (\beta, \eta)$ to denote the marginal mean model parameters with true values $\theta_0 = (\beta_0, \eta_0)$. We denote the estimating equation in 13 as $0 = 1/N \sum_{i=1}^{N} U_i(Z_i; \theta, \hat{\alpha}, \hat{\gamma})$, where Z_i is all observed covariates and responses for cluster i. It remains to show that $E[U_i(Z_i; \theta_0, \alpha^+, \gamma_0)] = 0_{p+q}$, from which consistency can be established as done for the standard GEE estimator (Liang and Zeger 1986). Here the expectation is over observed data (with respect to the distribution of the observed data, P_{obs}) as opposed to E_{a_1,a_2}, which is an expectation over data arising as if all clusters had received DTR (a_1, a_2) (with respect to the distribution P_{a_1,a_2}).

Note that $I(A_{1i}, R_i, A_{2i}, a_1, a_2)/W_i$ is the Radon-Nikodym derivative between P_{obs} and P_{a_1,a_2}. And thus,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&E[U_i(Z_i; \theta_0, \alpha^+, \gamma_0)] = \\
&\sum_{(a_1,a_2)} E_{a_1,a_2}[D(\mathbf{X}_i, a_1, a_2)^T V(\mathbf{X}_i, a_1, a_2, m; \alpha^+)^{-1}(\mathbf{Y}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{X}_i, a_1, a_2; \theta_0))] \\
&\sum_{(a_1,a_2)} E_{\mathbf{X}_i}[D(\mathbf{X}_i, a_1, a_2)^T V(\mathbf{X}_i, a_1, a_2, m; \alpha^+)^{-1}] E_{a_1,a_2}[\mathbf{Y}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{X}_i, a_1, a_2; \theta_0)|\mathbf{X}_i] \\
&= 0_{p+q}
\end{aligned}
$$

The final equation equals zero due to the conditional independence and correct specification of the marginal mean model.

We next prove the asymptotic normality of our estimator obtained in equation 13. We borrow notation from the previous proof.

Theorem 2. *Assuming mild regularity conditions, the same assumptions as in Theorem 1, the cluster sizes are bounded, and that the weight parameter γ is obtained from maximum likelihood estimation for treatment assignment probabilities, with a score function S_γ. Then $\sqrt{N}((\hat{\beta}, \hat{\eta}) - (\beta_0, \eta_0))$ is asymptotically multivariate normal with zero mean and covariance matrix $\Sigma_{\hat{\beta},\hat{\eta}} = J^{-1}(A - CB^{-1}C^T)J^{-1}$, where A, B, C, and J are given by*

$$
\begin{aligned}
J = \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} E \sum_{(a_1,a_2)} & I(A_{1i}, R_i, A_{2i}, a_1, a_2) W_i(\gamma_0) \\
& \cdot D(\boldsymbol{X}_i, a_1, a_2)^T V(\boldsymbol{X}_i, a_1, a_2, m_i; \alpha^+)^{-1} D(\boldsymbol{X}_i, a_1, a_2)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
A = \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} E[U_i U_i^T], B = \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} E[S_{\gamma_0,i} S_{\gamma_0,i}^T], C = \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} E[U_i S_{\gamma_0,i}^T]
$$

with $U_i \triangleq U_i(Z_i; \theta_0, \alpha^+, \gamma_0)$

Proof: Using the same argument for GEE estimators (Liang and Zeger 1986) we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sqrt{N}(\hat{\theta} - \theta_0) = \left[\lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{\partial U_i(Z_i; \theta_0, \alpha^+, \gamma_0)}{\partial \theta} \right]^{-1} & \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^{N} U_i(Z_i; \theta_0, \alpha^+, \gamma_0) \right. \\
& \left. + \left[\lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{\partial U_i(Z_i; \theta_0, \alpha^+, \gamma_0)}{\partial \gamma} \right] \sqrt{N}(\hat{\gamma} - \gamma_0) \right\} + o_p(1)
\end{aligned}
$$

Using the fact that S_γ is the score function for $\hat{\gamma}$ to express $\sqrt{N}(\hat{\gamma} - \gamma_0)$ as a sum. Also, using the fact that our cluster size is bounded combined with the Law of Large Numbers, we write all long-run averages of random variables as long run averages of expectations. Hence, we obtain:

$$\sqrt{N}(\hat{\theta}-\theta_0)=\left[\lim_{N\to\infty}\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}E\left\{\frac{\partial U_i}{\partial\theta}\right\}\right]^{-1}\left\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\sum_{i=1}^{N}U_i-\right.$$

$$\left.\left[\lim_{N\to\infty}\frac{1}{N}\sum_{j=1}^{N}E(U_jS_{\gamma_0,j}^T)\right]\left[\lim_{N\to\infty}\frac{1}{N}\sum_{j=1}^{N}E(S_{\gamma_0,j}S_{\gamma_0,j}^T)\right]^{-1}S_{\gamma_0,i}\right\}+o_p(1)$$

$$=J^{-1}\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\sum_{i=1}^{N}(U_i-CB^{-1}S_{\gamma_0,i})+o_p(1)\to Normal[0,J^{-1}(A-CB^{-1}C^T)J^{-1}]$$

Remark: Note that with unequal cluster sizes, U_i and $S_{\gamma,i}$ are not identically distributed, and hence we must express our variances with long run averages. If cluster sizes were equal, averaging would not be necessary and we would obtain $A=E[U_iU_i^T]$, $B=E[S_{\gamma_0}S_{\gamma_0}^T]$, $C=E[U_iS_{\gamma_0}^T]$, and $J=E[\partial U_i/\partial\theta]$.

To obtain estimates for our standard error of $(\hat{\beta},\hat{\eta})$ we use plug in estimates of A, B, C, and J. Specifically, we set:

$$\hat{J}=\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{(a_1,a_2)}I(A_{1i},R_i,A_{2i},a_1,a_2)W_i(\hat{\gamma})$$
$$\cdot D(\mathbf{X}_i,a_1,a_2)^TV(\mathbf{X}_i,a_1,a_2,m_i;\hat{\alpha})^{-1}D(\mathbf{X}_i,a_1,a_2)$$

$$\hat{A}=\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\hat{U}_i\hat{U}_i^T,\hat{B}=\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}S_{\hat{\gamma},i}S_{\hat{\gamma},i}^T,\hat{C}=\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\hat{U}_iS_{\hat{\gamma},i}^T$$

where $\hat{U}_i=U_i(Z_i;\hat{\theta},\hat{\alpha},\hat{\gamma})$

Thus, the plug in estimator for $\Sigma_{\hat{\theta}}$ is $\hat{\Sigma}_{\hat{\theta}}=\hat{J}^{-1}(\hat{A}-\hat{C}\hat{B}^{-1}\hat{C}^T)\hat{J}^{-1}$ and we obtain $\widehat{Var}(\hat{\theta})=1/N\cdot\hat{\Sigma}_{\hat{\theta}}$.